

“A Type of Warning” (1 Cor. 10:1-13)

Rich Lusk

3-27-11

1 Cor. 10:1-13 is such a rich and deep theological chapter, it would take several books to come close to fully exhausting its themes. In these follow-up notes, I want to touch on a few things I was not able to develop in the sermon, and point to some additional reading materials for further study.

The best exposition of this text is found, as would be expected, in Richard Hays' commentary. His book *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* also deals with this passage fairly extensively.

1 Cor. 10:1-13 is a key passage in the development of what we call covenant theology because of the way it relates Israel to the church and the old covenant to the new covenant; clearly, this passage indicates we should read the whole Bible as one progressively unfolding story of one people. The passage is also crucial to the development of typological hermeneutics; it shows us we should read the Hebrew Scriptures as a foreshadowing and prefiguring of Christ and the church (*totus christus*). The passage is a vital piece of sacramental theology, giving us an excellent summary of the theology and practice of baptism and the Lord's Supper; while these rites are clearly more than mere symbols, they are not “magical” guarantees of salvation. The passage speaks directly to how we should live as Christians in the culture, engaging the world around us without falling away into worldliness, fighting against the temptations that assail our souls. And the passage gives us a deep understanding of apostasy because it so clearly teaches that this is such a thing as a temporary partaking of Christ; past experiences of God's goodness do not serve as a spiritual insurance policy, covering us no matter how we live.

On the “end of the ages” in 10:11, see Fee, 459. It is possible Paul has in view a correlation between the 40 year apostolic period and the 40 year period of Israel wandering the wilderness. During that window of the apostolic era, the old and new covenants/ages overlapped each other (cf. Heb. 3-4). But whatever the case, there are still analogies between Israel in the wilderness and the church in the pre-resurrection state. What is abundantly clear is that Paul considered the Corinthians to be living at the climatic turning of the ages; the various epochs of the old covenant order had been fulfilled in Christ and were winding down, even as the new age was ramping up.

On the literary structure of this part of 1 Cor., see John Breck, *The Shape of Biblical Language*, 247f.

On baptism, see Peter Leithart, *Baptized Body*; Doug Wilson, *To a 1000 Generations*; Mark Horne, *Why Do We Baptize Babies?*; On the Lord's Supper, see Peter Leithart, *Blessed Are the Hungry*; Geoffrey Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology*; Keith Mathison, *Given For You*.

On the use of typology in 1 Cor. 10, see Richard Davidson's study *Typology in Scripture*. Davidson includes a helpful discussion of whether or not "tupos" language in this passage is strictly paranesis (ethics), or also hermeneutical. Davidson argues that Paul uses "tupos" language when he is interpreting OT events, rituals and persons from the perspective of the eschatological Christ-event; Christ is the ultimate point of orientation for all typological structures. According to Davidson, the type and its fulfillment have a relationship of escalated/intensified correspondence. Davidson proves the folly of those who say that we cannot derive ethics or doctrine from biblical typology; in 1 Cor. 10:1ff, we have an entire section in which both the doctrine and the ethics are based on an extended typological argument.

A type is a preview, a mold, a pattern, which gives shape and background to future events, rituals and personages. Typology is the rhythm of history. The type can find direct fulfillment in its antitype (David killing Goliath, pointing to Jesus' victory over Satan), or the antitype can fulfill the type by way of contrast (the fall of Adam contrasted with the obedience of the Last Adam). In 1 Cor. 10, we find both: the Israelites prefigure the church in her spiritual redemption and blessings; but whether or not they prefigure the Corinthian church in their fall into sin was still an open-ended question when Paul wrote his letter.

Jim Jordan on typology from *Through New Eyes*:

Typology is the fundamental Biblical philosophy of history...It means that the successive stages of world history have a meaning, a meaning related to the heavenly pattern and God's purpose to glorify man and the world progressively....The key to unlocking the meaning of history lies in the typological blueprint of heaven, as heaven progressively is impressed upon the earth, and as the Heavenly Man, Jesus Christ, is progressively impressed upon His people.

More from Jordan (Biblical Horizons newsletter no. 89):

From time to time, when I've lectured on how to read the Bible, I've used art-music as one example thereof. When we listen to a simple folk song, we hear the same melody over and over again, but this is not how composers write "high" music. Let me amplify.

A composer will put out a theme (melody) clearly and forthrightly. You can hear it without difficulty. And, from time to time that melody will come back, and without difficulty you will hear it again. But what you probably won't hear, unless you are trained to listen to music, is that the melody is being used in more ways. It may be broken down, and parts of it used in various ways in the overall piece. It may be played in the bass line, or in an alto line, underneath a more prominent second melody or theme. You'll hear the new melody, and not notice that the old melody is being used underneath. The

melody may be stretched out into slower notes (augmented), or played twice as fast (diminished). It may be used like a round (canon; rickar; fugue), coming in over and over again on top of itself. It may be inverted (switching high and low notes), or played cancrizans (backwards). (A good listener can hear an inversion, but it takes a really good one to notice when the melody runs backwards.) The melody may be taken from a minor key to a major one, or vice versa. A composer will introduce one theme, and then another, and then play them at the same time.

Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, which starts with the famous four note theme (motif) "da-da-da-DAH," actually uses that four-note motif and its inherent possibilities as the foundation for virtually everything in all four movements. We don't notice it, however, until someone points it out to us, and shows us how it happens. And that's okay. The symphony can be enjoyed either "naively" or "maturely."

Now, the Bible is certainly written this way. We have, for instance, the theme of God's giving Adam a garden to dress and guard, and then Adam sins and is expelled. This theme comes up again, clearly, several times in the Old Testament: at the golden calf, with King Saul, with King David, etc. The theme reaches its great climax with Jesus, who is expelled for us. But the theme is also stretched out (augmented) as the story of Israel from Joshua to the Exile, and from the Restoration to AD 70. Moreover, there are places in the Bible where another theme is prominent, but we can see this original theme also playing along.

The study of these recurring themes goes under the general name "typology." When I present this information, I usually get asked by someone understandably suspicious: Are you saying you have to be a musician to understand the Bible? There are three answers to that question.

Answer No. 1: No, because the basic facts of redemption and obedience are clear to any Christian reader of the Bible. Yet, it is the glory of God to conceal a matter, and the glory of kings to search it out (Prov. 25:2).

Answer No. 2: No, but it helps, because seeing the deeper things in the Bible, some of them at least, is like hearing music in a mature way.

Answer No. 3: Yes, because God indicates that His people are to be musicians. Let's ask: Does it help to be an athlete to understand the Bible? No. Does it help to be an engineer to understand the Bible. No. At least not in any obvious way.

But: Does it help to be a musician to understand the Bible? Yes, because the Bible indicates that this is so.

First, music is the God-appointed way of worshipping Him with His own words. The psalms are to be set to music and sung, and in fact a great deal of Western art music developed out of the complex ways in which psalms were set by art musicians. More than that, however, we find in the Masoretic Hebrew text of the Old Testament a whole system of pitch marks, which indicate the chanting lines for the text as it existed when the Masoretic text was produced. A French musical scholar named Haik-Vantoura has offered a decoding of these pitches, but whether she is right or not in her suggested

system, there is no doubt but that the text was originally chanted in worship. Sung worship is typical of all pre-modern worship all over the world. Second, the Spirit is given to help us understand the Word, and the Spirit is the Glorifier. He is the Breath, the sounding forth of the Word. Whenever words are said out loud, they are said musically. Your speech goes up and down, is loud and soft, is punctuated rhythmically by consonants and emphasis, assumes various tones (timbres; such as rough, kind, whiny, etc.). In short, all speech is quasi-musical. The Spirit inspires music, and He is the Music of God, who is Author, Word, Music. Thus, being musical and learning about music should add to our ability to grasp the text.

Third, we find that the priests and Levites were established as the teachers of the Word in Israel; but they were also set up as the musicians in the Temple. By linking these two things, God was saying that a teacher of the Word would be wise also to be a musician. (Levites were also guards, and some familiarity with what that means is also good for a teacher/elder in the Church.)

Thus, we see that God programmed music into the minds and hearts of those set apart to interpret the Bible, and into the minds and hearts of all those in Israel who would encounter the text more generally.

In sum, if we want to train people in understanding the Bible more fully, it is good to train them in musical understanding. Music should be part of the educational preparation of anyone engaged in Biblical study and hermeneutics.

Why isn't this done today? Because of the influence of Western rationalism, especially through the "science ideal" of the Enlightenment. Poetry, which used to be sung, is sung no longer. Many people don't realize that even post-Renaissance poetry should be read out loud; it should be heard, if not actually sung. (I have a lot of hope for what may eventually develop out of rap music, despite its sorry beginnings today; it moves toward a restoration of the original form of poetry.) We read silently. We no longer sing or whistle while we work. Philosophy, which is contemplative rather than active and liturgical, has influenced theology and Bible study way too much.

Thus, we don't live in a social and ecclesiastical context that would enable us to read and understand the Bible as well as we might. Restoring music to our lives will help.

John Barach on typology:

It's come to my attention that there are some people who teach that we shouldn't identify something in the Old Testament as a type of Christ unless the New Testament makes that identification explicit. So it's okay to say that the rock in the wilderness was a type of Christ because Paul says so in 1 Corinthians 10. But it's not okay to say that the story of Joseph is a type of Christ because the New Testament never says so, even though it should be clear to any Christian reading Genesis that Joseph is rejected by his brothers, goes down to the pit, rises again in glory, ascends to the throne at the right hand of the king, is reconciled to his brothers, and ends up feeding the world,

so that all the nations are blessed in him. In spite of how much that sounds like Christ, this view says, the New Testament doesn't *say explicitly* that Joseph is a type of Christ and therefore we shouldn't either.

Here's a question I have for such people: When God says in Genesis 3:15 that the seed of the woman will crush the head of the serpent, do you think that's talking about Christ's victory over Satan? Surely the answer would be "Yes." I don't think that's the *only* thing that promise refers to. It includes other victories over enemies, other crushings of the heads of serpents, such as Jael's crushing the head of Sisera or David's crushing the head of Goliath. But surely that promise ultimately points to Christ's victory over Satan, the crushing of Satan's head.

But where does the New Testament ever make that typology explicit? There are certainly passages which talk about Christ triumphing over Satan (e.g., Col. 2:15), but they don't allude to Genesis 3:15. In Revelation 12:9, we hear about the "great dragon," who is "that serpent of old, called the Devil and Satan," but even here we don't hear that Christ crushed his head. Instead, we're told that war broke out and Michael won the victory and cast the serpent to the earth.

The only fairly clear allusion to Genesis 3:15 that I can think of in the New Testament is in Romans 16:20: "And the God of peace will crush Satan under your feet shortly." But here it's the *church* which has Satan crushed under its feet. Granted, the church is the body of Christ, and so this may be (and I think is) a fulfillment of Genesis 3:15, but it certainly doesn't state explicitly that Genesis 3:15 is speaking about Christ.

Furthermore, the only *explicit* connection to Genesis 3:15 here in Romans 16 might be the term "crush." After all, Genesis 3:15 says nothing about *feet*, and Romans 16:20 says nothing about the serpent, its head, or its bruising of someone's heel. In fact, you'll search the entire New Testament and never once find any reference to the serpent bruising someone's heel, let alone Christ's heel.

If you can find another passage in the New Testament that explicitly indicates that the seed of the woman in Genesis 3:15 is a type of Christ, please point me to it. But I don't think there is one.

On the principle of the people I mentioned in the opening paragraph, then, we may not say that Genesis 3:15 is speaking of Christ. But surely it is. And just as surely, then, the principle must be wrong. If it is the case that we may not identify something as a type unless the New Testament does, then Genesis 3:15 doesn't speak of Christ. If Genesis 3:15 does speak of Christ, then we may indeed draw typological connections even if the New Testament doesn't.

Toby Sumpter on typology:

A "type" in biblical literature is commonly understood as a kind of "preview." Paul says that Adam was a "type" of Jesus who was to come (Rom. 5:14). These previews can also work as "examples" or "patterns" to follow or learn

from: the unbelieving Israelites in the wilderness are examples for Christians to warn them (1 Cor. 10:6), Moses saw the pattern of the tabernacle on the mountain and was to follow it in the construction of the house of God (Acts 7:44, Heb. 8:5)), and Paul will call upon believers to follow his "example" (Phil. 3:17, 2 Thess. 3:9) or commend others for becoming faithful examples (1 Thess. 1:7). A "type" is ultimately a sort of "image" (e.g. Acts 7:43). In this sense, the "image of God" in man is a replication of the "type" of God which comes to fulfillment in Jesus. It points to the origin; it refers to the archetype.

But the word *tupos* also means "mark" or "blow." It is only used once in the New Testament in this sense and refers to the "mark" of the nails in the hands of Jesus. Thomas says that unless he sees the "mark of the nails, and place my finger into the mark of the nails, and place my hand into his side, I will never believe" (Jn. 20:25). But the verb form of this word *tupto* occurs numerous times in the NT and means "beat" or "strike." Jesus is "struck" (Mt. 27:30, Mk. 15:19, Lk. 22:64), later Sosthenes is "beaten" (Acts 18:17), and Paul is beaten (Acts 21:32) and "struck" (Acts 23:2). This suggests a couple of possible directions to run with this. First, to call people to follow the pattern/example of Jesus or the apostles, is to call them to be "pierced" or "struck" or "beaten" into conformity with the image. Jesus is the perfect image of the invisible God, the type of the image of God that we are striving to be conformed to. Second, this suggests that the "example" of Christ and the apostles and other believers so frequently associated with suffering should perhaps be taken more literally. To be "beaten" for Jesus, to be "struck" for His name is to bear in the body the "marks" of Christ. Paul uses a different word in Galatians 6:17, but the parallel seems unmistakable. The "type" is struck in the believer in so far as their suffering is suffering for good (like Christ) but the "mark" is not merely illustrative, it is also efficacious and transformative. Like a bit of soft wax pressed with the image of the King, the marks of Christ leave an indelible reality of God's Life pressed into the individual who suffers. No wonder the apostles call us to rejoice. Lastly, and a bit more speculative, it seems like there is a temporal-eschatological promise implied in this picture. Given these previous points, "types" seem to function as prophetic signs. "Types" call upon God to fulfill them. Sacraments are the supreme types, but even people, persecution, and various patterns seem to function as invitations for God to interpose the reality into history to which the "type" points. Perhaps more provocatively, types strain forward into the future and at the same time pull the future back into the present. While God does know the end from the beginning and certainly orchestrates all things according to His good counsel, there is nevertheless clearly a mysterious way in which humanity is invited into influencing the course of history. Prophets speak in the divine assembly, and God listens to them. God changes His mind; the future is not fixed in an abstract filing cabinet in heaven. The future is held in the hand of our faithful Father. This would mean that "pounding" an obedient type into the present is one of the ways that God invites our participation in the future. The imprint, the mark of

faithfulness will remain, and more than that, perhaps we have far more impact on the future than we sometimes imagine.

Paul says the “rock” in the wilderness was Christ. Of course, in the OYT, the rock is YHWH, so this is a clear pointer not only to the pre-incarnate existence of Christ, but to his deity. The rock was one of many pre-incarnate christophanies.

On the glory cloud and baptism, see Ray Sutton, *Signed, Sealed, and Delivered*, 216ff, 219ff.

The fivefold repetition of “all” in 1 Cor. 10:1-4 provides an argument for covenant theology, paedobaptism, and paedocommunion. It also reminds us that God is interested in saving whole families and whole nations, not just scattered individuals. The “alls” of verses 1-4 must be contrasted with the “most” and “some” of the verses that follow. All were blessed, redeemed, partakers of Christ, etc.; not all persevered to the end. Paul did not see the bad ending as a sign that they were never really blessed, but as proof that they had fallen from blessing.

Charles Hodge on 1 Cor. 10:12:

There is a perpetual danger of falling. No degree of progress we may have already made, no amount of privilege that we may have enjoyed, can justify a lack of caution...False security of salvation commonly rests on the basis of our belonging to a privileged body (the church) or to a privileged class (the elect). Both are equally fallacious. Neither the members of the church nor the elect can be saved unless they persevere in holiness; and they cannot persevere in holiness without continual watchfulness and effort.

Peter Leithart on church and apostasy:

Turning to more substantive theological claims, Lucas says that "Leithart somehow claims that the church is salvation in its corporate representation and (presumably) to be part of the church is to be saved. This, in turn, leads to a new (to the Reformed tradition) emphasis upon baptism as the means for entering the church's salvation, which logically leads to the idea that to be baptized is to be saved."

Lucas has hit on what I think is the crucial issue in the whole Federal Vision bruha: Ecclesiology. I think, though, that he has equivocated on some of his terms here. When I say that the church is "salvation," I am playing one of what Lucas describes as my word games.

Here's the argument, or one of them: God created man as a social being; God saved man; therefore, God saved man as a social being, restoring Him to true sociality; therefore, salvation must take a social form; if salvation is already achieved, it must have been achieved in social form; the church is that social form of salvation.

This argument must be crossed (as it is in my book) with the already-not yet: The church is the new humanity, the location where God has begun to save the human race; but the church is not yet the consummated new humanity, because God has not yet finished saving the human race. Some within the church will be cut off in time, others at the last judgment. But the presence of false sons, the presence of some who will not finally be saved, does not change the reality of the church as the restored human race.

Baptism is the induction to the new humanity. But Lucas's logic only works if when I use "saved" with reference to the church I mean "eternally saved." But I don't. So there's no logical inference to be had; and I simply don't teach that everyone who is baptized is eternally saved. Nobody, I dare say, has *ever* taught that, and I don't aim to be the first.

The point can be made in terms of 1 Corinthians 10. Who was saved from Egypt? All Israel. Who was baptized into Moses in the cloud and sea? All Israel. Who drank from the spiritual Rock that was Christ? All Israel. Who persevered to the promised land? Not all Israel. Many fell in the wilderness.

1 Cor. 10 suggests there is both continuity and discontinuity between Israel and the church. Perhaps to capture this dynamic, we should speak of covenant transformation, or transfiguration. The new Israel is the old Israel eschatologically transformed; the church is Israel, dead and raised again in Christ. See Vern Poythress, *The Shadow of Christ in the Law of Moses*; Christopher J. H. Wright, *Knowing Jesus Through the Old Testament*; *Jesus and Israel* by David Holwerda; *The Drama of Scripture* by Michael Goheen; *From Shadow to Reality* by Jean Danlieou; *Medival Exegesis* by Henri de Lubac; etc. Obviously, Paul believed in continuity between Israel and the church; without a deep analogy between the experience of the Israelites and the church, the passage makes no sense and his argument falls apart. This continuity leads Paul to draw parallels precisely where many Christians today would want him to draw contrasts. But there is also discontinuity. After all, the Israelites were baptized, like us, but they were baptized into Moses, whereas we are baptized into Christ. Their spiritual experience prefigures ours, but cannot be fully equated with it.

The theme of God's faithfulness to his people in the wilderness is rooted in Deut. 7:9. God was faithful to the wilderness community; he was faithful to the Corinthians; and he is faithful to us. There is never an excuse for a Christian falling away.

In the sermon, I mentioned that Paul catalogs four examples of Israel's unfaithfulness in the wilderness. In addition to these highlights (or lowlights?), 1 Cor. 10:6 may actually provide a fifth case of Israelite apostasy. Hays, p. 162f, suggests that the language of "lusting" or "craving" recalls Numbers 11:4, where the Israelites craved meat as part of their rebellion against God.

It is vital to note that each case study Paul pulls out of the Israelite wilderness narrative corresponds almost exactly to some sin problem already identified in

Corinth. In other words, what Paul says about the record of old covenant history 1 Cor. 10:11 is literally true.

This whole section is designed to show that not only is participation in idol feasts a threat to the spiritual well-being of the weak (the overarching concern of 1 Cor. 8-11); it is also a threat to the strong, who think they are standing firm but can actually be swept away in a tide of idolatry. Understood this way, 1 Cor. 10:1-13 fits snugly within the wider argument Paul has been making (and will continue to make), while supplementing and advancing beyond what he has already said.

That the Israelites were real apostates should not be disputed. This is not to say each and every individual who died in the wilderness was unsaved (e.g., Moses). The point is that, as a group, on the whole, they fell away from God and were judged accordingly. But it will not do to say that this proves they only experienced “external” or “social” blessings though the exodus and their sacraments. In 1 Cor. 10, Paul makes it clear they shared in Christ in some way. We also have the OT record itself, which repeatedly says the Israelites, worshipped, believed, feared, etc. God (Ex. 4:31; 14:31). It will not do to say that their redemption was merely a physical picture of the spiritual redemption we have experienced; theirs was a spiritual deliverance as well. The fact that so many failed stands as a warning to us.

Going to an idolatrous feast while expecting to it not to cause spiritual harm is like drinking poison and then praying for health.

Paul says 23,000 died in one day, but Numbers 25:9 says 24,000 died. How do we reconcile this discrepancy? Calvin says the actual number was 23,500, so the difference is due to rounding up versus rounding down. Another theory is that 23,000 died in one day, with another 1,000 the following day. Another solution, followed by Garland (462f) is that Paul is deliberately mixing Num. 25:9 with Ex. 32:28, since both passages are relevant to the discussion about idolatry.

Calvin on the Lord's Supper:

That we really feed in the Holy Supper on the flesh and blood of Christ, no otherwise than as bread and wine are the aliments of our bodies, we freely confess. If a clearer explanation is asked, we say, that the substance of Christ's flesh and blood is our spiritual life, and that it is communicated to us under the symbols of bread and wine; for Christ, in instituting the mystery of The Supper, promised nothing falsely, nor mocked us with a vain shew, but represented by external signs what he has really given us.

From Calvin's "Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ":

But as the blessings of Jesus Christ do not belong to us at all, unless he be previously ours, it is necessary, first of all, that he be given us in the Supper,

in order that the things which we have mentioned may be truly accomplished in us. For this reason I am wont to say, that the substance of the sacraments is the Lord Jesus, and the efficacy of them the graces and blessings which we have by his means. Now the efficacy of the Supper is to confirm to us the reconciliation which we have with God through our Savior's death and passion; the washing of our souls which we have in the shedding of his blood; the righteousness which we have in his obedience; in short, the hope of salvation which we have in all that he has done for us. It is necessary, then, that the substance should be conjoined with these, otherwise nothing would be firm or certain. Hence we conclude that two things are presented to us in the Supper, viz., Jesus Christ as the source and substance of all good; and, secondly, the fruit and efficacy of his death and passion. This is implied in the words which were used. For after commanding us to eat his body and drink his blood, he adds that his body was delivered for us, and his blood shed for the remission of our sins. Hereby he intimates, first, that we ought not simply to communicate in his body and blood, without any other consideration, but in order to receive the fruit derived to us from his death and passion; secondly that we can attain the enjoyment of such fruit only by participating in his body and blood, from which it is derived.

Calvin again:

For they were favored with the same benefits as we at this day enjoy; there was a Church of God among them, as there is at this day among us; they had the same sacraments, to be tokens to them of the grace of God; but, on their abusing their privileges, they did not escape the judgment of God... He treats first of baptism, and teaches that the cloud, which protected the Israelites in the desert from the heat of the sun, and directed their course, and also their passage through the sea, was to them as a baptism; he says, also, that in the manna, and the water flowing from the rock, there was a sacrament which corresponded with the sacred Supper... For, if the manna was spiritual food, it follows, that it is not bare emblems that are presented to us in the Sacraments, but that the thing represented is at the same time truly imparted, for God is not a deceiver to feed us with empty fancies. A sign, it is true, *is* a sign, and retains its essence, but, as Papists act a ridiculous part, who dream of transformations, (I know not of what sort,) so it is not for us to separate between the reality and the emblem which God has conjoined. Papists confound the reality and the sign: profane men, as, for example, Suenckfeldius, and the like, separate the signs from the realities. Let us maintain a middle course, or, in other words, let us observe the connection appointed by the Lord, but still keep them distinct, that we may not mistakingly transfer to the one what belongs to the other... It remains that we speak of the *second* point — the resemblance between the ancient signs and ours. It is a well-known dogma of the schoolmen — that the Sacraments of the ancient law were emblems of grace, but ours confer it. This

passage is admirably suited for refuting that error, for it shows that the reality of the Sacrament was presented to the ancient people of God no less than to us. It is therefore a base fancy of the Sorbonists, that the holy fathers under the law had the signs without the reality. I grant, indeed, that the efficacy of the signs is furnished to us at once more clearly and more abundantly from the time of Christ's manifestation in the flesh than it was possessed by the fathers. Thus there is a difference between us and them only in degree, or, (as they commonly say,) of "more and less," for we receive more fully what they received in a smaller measure. It is not as if they had had bare emblems, while we enjoy the reality....

That rock was Christ" is apply the name of the thing to the sign, much like Calvin does with baptism and the Eucharist....

I have, however, already stated, that the reality of the things signified was exhibited in connection with the ancient sacraments. As, therefore, they were emblems of Christ, it follows, that Christ was connected with them, not locally, nor by a natural or substantial union, but sacramentally. On this principle the Apostle says, that *the rock was Christ*, for nothing is more common than metonymy in speaking of sacraments. The name of the thing, therefore, is transferred here to the sign — not as if it were strictly applicable, but figuratively, on the ground of that connection which I have mentioned. I touch upon this, however, the more slightly, because it will be more largely treated of when we come to the 11th Chapter....

Here it is objected, "If it is true, that hypocrites and wicked persons in that age ate spiritual meat, do unbelievers in the present day partake of the reality in the sacraments?" Some, afraid lest the unbelief of men should seem to detract from the truth of God, teach that the reality is received by the wicked along with the sign. This fear, however, is needless, for the Lord offers, it is true, to the worthy and to the unworthy what he represents, but all are not capable of receiving it. In the meantime, the sacrament does not change its nature, nor does it lose anything of its efficacy. Hence the manna, in relation to God, was spiritual meat even to unbelievers, but because the mouth of unbelievers was but carnal, they did not eat what was given them. The fuller discussion, however, of this question I reserve for the 11th Chapter.

More Calvin:

We begin now to enter on the question so much debated, both anciently and at the present time—how we are to understand the words in which the bread is called the body of Christ, and the wine his blood. This may be disposed of without much difficulty, if we carefully observe the principle which I lately laid down, viz., that all the benefit which we should seek in the Supper is annihilated if Jesus Christ be not there given to us as the substance and foundation of all. That being fixed, we will confess, without doubt, that to deny that a true communication of Jesus Christ is presented to us in the Supper, is to render this holy sacrament frivolous and useless—an execrable blasphemy unfit to be listened to.

More from Calvin:

Indeed, the apostle makes the Israelites equal to us not only in the grace of the covenant but also in the signification of the sacraments. In recounting examples of the punishments which, according to Scripture, the Israelites were chastised of old, his purpose was to deter the Corinthians from falling into similar misdeeds. So he begins with this premise: there is no reason why we should claim any privilege for ourselves, to deliver us from the vengeance of God, which they underwent, since the Lord not only provided them with the same benefits but also manifested his grace among them by the same symbols. It is as if he said: "Suppose you trust that you are out of danger because both Baptism, with which you have been sealed, and the Supper, of which you partake daily, possess excellent promises, but at the same time you hold God's goodness in contempt and play the wanton. Know that the Jews did not lack such symbols, and yet the Lord carried out his harsh judgments against them. They were baptized in crossing the sea and in the cloud that protected them from the sun's heat." Our opponents call that crossing a carnal baptism, which corresponds in a certain measure to our spiritual baptism. But if that were accepted as true, the apostle's argument would not be effective. For Paul here means to disabuse Christians of thinking they are superior to the Jews through the privilege of baptism. Nor is what immediately follows subject to this cavil: "They ate the same spiritual food and drank the same spiritual drink." This he interprets as referring to Christ (2.10.5).

Again, Calvin:

But we must utterly reject that scholastic dogma (to touch on it also in passing) which notes such a great difference between the sacraments of the old and new law, as if the former only foreshadowed God's grace, but the latter give it as a present reality. Indeed the apostle speaks just as clearly concerning the former as the latter when he teaches that the fathers ate the same spiritual food as we, and explains that food as Christ. Who dared treat as an empty sign that which revealed the true communion of Christ to the Jews?....

In different signs there is the same faith; it is the same with different signs as it is with different words; for words change their sounds from time to time; and words are nothing but signs. The fathers drank the same spiritual drink, but not the same physical one, as ours. See therefore, how faith remains while signs change. With them Christ was the Rock; for us Christ is that which is put on the altar. They drank, as a great sacrament, water flowing from the rock; believers know what we drink. If you look at the visible appearance, they drank something different; if you look at the inner signification, they drank the same spiritual drink.....

These things which we have said both of mortification and of washing were foreshadowed in the people of Israel, who were on this account said by the Apostle to have been “baptized in the cloud and in the sea.” Mortification was symbolized when the Lord, rescuing the people from the domination and cruel bondage of Pharaoh, made a way for them through the Red Sea and drowned both Pharaoh himself and the Egyptian army, who were in hot pursuit and almost at their backs. For in the same way he also promises us in baptism and shows us by a sign given that by his power we have been led out and delivered from bondage in Egypt, that is, from the bondage of sin; that our Pharaoh, that is, the devil, has been drowned. . . . In the cloud there was a symbol of cleansing. For as the Lord covered them with a cloud and gave them coolness, that they might not weaken and pine away in the merciless heat of the sun, so do we recognize that in baptism we are covered and protected by Christ’s blood, that God’s severity, which is truly an unbearable flame, should not assail us (4.15.9).

Again, Calvin:

Paul knew that when the Lord rained down manna from heaven he did not do so merely to feed their bellies, but also bestowed it as a spiritual mystery, to foreshadow the spiritual quickening we have in Christ. Therefore he did not neglect this aspect, the one principally worth considering. From this we can conclude with full certainty that the Lord not only communicated to the Jews the same promises of eternal and heavenly life as he now deigns to give us, but also sealed them with truly spiritual sacraments. Augustine debates this matter at length in his work *Against Faustus the Manichee* (*ibid.*).

For Calvin, the old covenant saints had real sacraments, through which they really received Christ. In the new covenant, we have an even greater experience of the same Christ in the sacraments. In the Eucharist, Christ is substantially present by his Spirit to bless the faithful and curse the unfaithful. For Calvin, the true presence of Christ in the Supper is not localized through a change in the bread and wine. Rather, as we eat and drink these elements, the Spirit enables us to feed on Christ as he is seated in the heavens.

Calvin did not use the language of “real presence” with regard to the Supper, but he clearly believes Christ is *really*, even *substantially*, present. For Calvin, if Christ is not present in the supper, there is no real benefit in partaking; the supper becomes, at best a religious work, dependent on our own strength. But by the same token, if we seek to localize Christ in the elements, we conceive of his presence in the wrong way and ignore the sense in which he is still absent from us until his final return in glory.

Mark Horne on paedocommunion, using 1 Cor. 10:1-13:

<http://www.hornes.org/theologia/mark-horne/john-calvin-paedocommunion>

<http://www.hornes.org/theologia/mark-horne/you-and-your-son-and-daughter>

<http://www.hornes.org/theologia/mark-horne/a-brief-response-to-rev-richard-bacons-opposition-to-paedocommunion>

<http://www.hornes.org/theologia/mark-horne/a-response-to-rev-bacons-argument-that-manna-was-not-a-sacrament>

Tommy Lee on the history of paedocommunion:

http://www.reformed.org/social/index.html?mainframe=http://www.reformed.org/sacramentology/tl_paedo.html

Doug Wilson, “Stumbling into Apostasy,” using covenant children as a test case (from *Credenda Agenda*, vol. 13, no. 2):

American evangelicals have a hard time understanding the apostasy of covenant children because we have a deficient view of what the covenant means. Children who fall away are always a familial tragedy, but we must come to understand these tragedies against the backdrop of the greater tragedy, a tragedy which positively encourages this process—the error of blurring the doctrine of election with the doctrine of the covenant. Again and again, we tend to usurp the prerogatives of Deity. We assume that we can see regeneration, and then, on the basis of this, we admit a child to those covenant privileges which the whole world can see. We have it exactly backwards. The Holy Spirit blows where He wills, and the internal work of God is invisible. The water of baptism is physically there. A man can splash it. Membership in the covenant of God is objective. It can be photographed. Ultimate faithfulness to the covenant, in the final analysis, can be seen only by God. But we pretend to see what only God can see, and then, as a result, we are faithless to the terms of the covenant which we could see if we would only remove the blinders of our own man-made evangelical traditions. Jesus teaches us that He is the vine, and that we are the branches (Jn. 15:1–7). He says explicitly that some of His branches can be cut off and burned. Paul warns the Roman church against the sin of covenantal hubris (Rom. 11:20). The Jews had previously become proud and had been cut out of the covenant. If the Roman Gentiles do not heed this warning, Paul says, the same thing will happen to them. The implication is plain—not every covenant member is regenerate. Not every covenant member is elect. Not every covenant member bears fruit. Paul also tells us that we cannot be presumptive in our baptism—the Jews were baptized in the cloud and in the sea. We cannot presumptively rest in the fact that we in the new covenant have the Lord’s Supper. They also had spiritual food and drink, received from

Christ Himself, and yet their bodies were scattered over the desert (1 Cor. 10:2–5). These things are our examples.

Consistently, at the very places where the New Testament draws parallels between the Christian church and the Jews in the wilderness, modern theologians try to draw contrasts.

All this means that a man can be genuinely attached to Christ and yet bear no fruit. He is as attached as the fruit-bearing branch is. They both partake of the root and fatness of the tree. Sap flows to both branches. The fruitless branch tastes the

heavenly gift. He has been enlightened (Heb. 6:4). And, when the process of apostasy comes to completion, he tramples underfoot the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified (Heb. 10:29).

All such apostasy passages have been much abused by Arminianism, which teaches that election is up for grabs. But these passages are equally abused by Calvinistic exegetes who won't let the Scriptures issue any solemn warnings to the covenant people of God. Arminianism wants conditions without a covenant, and much of traditional Calvinism wants a covenant without conditions. In this latter system, such warnings are frequently taken as merely hypothetical—kind of like “stay away from the cliff” signs in the middle of Kansas.

But apostasy is a real sin, committed by real people. These people are covenant members who are not elect. But the fact they are not elect does not mean (as is commonly assumed) that they have no real connection to the vine or olive tree. The nonelect covenant member is, in this sense, a true covenant member. He is not a tumbleweed caught in the branches—he is connected to the trunk and receives some kind of nourishment from it. Because we only use the term Christian with reference to the invisible things of God, the term has been the source of much confusion. But the term refers, in different ways, to both election and the covenant. St. Paul was a Jew, and so was Caiaphas. But the circumcision which matters at the last day is of the heart, by the Spirit (Rom. 2:29). Charles Spurgeon was a Christian, and so was Alexander VI. But a servant abides in the house temporarily (John 8:35). Because we have rejected the objectivity of the covenant, we assume that the term Christian has only one meaning, and is therefore some kind of automatic compliment.

So how are we to understand a child who grew up in a covenant home, has been baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and yet who is now living in high defiance of the gospel? Seeing that he is manifesting the works of the flesh, and not the fruit of the Spirit, can we say he is a Christian? The answer is that of course he is a Christian. But he is a Christian in the same sense that an adulterer is a husband.

When a covenant child rebels against his upbringing, and he rejects what his church and family has taught him, this means that he is (unless he repents) in greater trouble, not less trouble. Baptism is not a feel-good ceremony which gets an infant part of the way there. It is a covenant sign,

which solemnizes his covenant obligations, and this covenant has sanctions—attendant blessings and curses.

Grieving parents must not minimize the danger a wayward child is in. But neither should they despair. As they pray for their child, and they look for a place to hold while they plead, they can be encouraged in this. The covenant has handles.

Can salvation be lost? See Jude 6, which also uses the exodus/wilderness paradigm and says, very succinctly, that Israel was “saved” and then “destroyed.” But given that “salvation” language can describe both our present experience of God’s grace, as well as the future consummation of our deliverance from sin and death, the language of “covenant breaking” works better than “losing salvation.”

Derrick Olliff’s essay “All in the Family”

(<http://beatenbrains.blogspot.com/2008/03/all-in-family.html>) is very helpful on covenant conditionality and apostasy:

A Primer on Covenantal Objectivity and Apostasy

The relatively recent controversy in Reformed circles over the “Federal Vision” is complicated and involves disagreement over a number of issues. One of the broader issues has been termed the “objectivity of the covenant.” Who are the members of the new covenant, and what if anything do they receive by virtue of their membership in the covenant (i.e., without regards to how faithful they are toward God)? How does God relate to the “visible” Church, and in particular to those who are in the Church but who are not faithful to Him? Intimately related to this is the issue of apostasy from the covenant. When a non-elect (using the Westminster Confession sense of the term ‘elect’) individual who is a Church member falls away, what if anything has he lost? Was he ever really in covenant with God to begin with? Was he ever really a Christian?

In this essay, I would like to address these broad issues without going into much detail. What follows will therefore be a somewhat extended outline of covenantal objectivity and apostasy along with some discussion of common criticisms of these ideas.

In Reformed circles, it is common for us to make strong and clear distinctions within the covenant between the “elect” and the “reprobate.” The former are often said to be in the covenant “internally” while the later are only in it “externally.” Particular Baptists, whom I think are more consistent at this point, only distinguish between those who are in the covenant and those who are not. If one is in the covenant (or in it “internally”), it is because he has been elected to eternal life. He can never finally fall away. On the other hand, if someone is not part of the elect, he will never be in covenant with God. And if someone does leave the Church after having professed faith, this just

proves that he never had “true” faith to begin with. He was never really in the covenant – never in it internally. He may have been in the “sphere” of the covenant and may have seen some “common operations of the Spirit” but he was never truly nourished by the covenantal grace of God.

It is not difficult to see why we say these kinds of things. We do this in order to protect the integrity and truth of our decretal doctrines, most noticeably the “five points of Calvinism.” But I believe this is both unnecessary and problematic. Our overzealous hedging of these doctrines is unnecessary because the doctrines of covenantal objectivity and apostasy need not contradict Reformed decretal doctrines and it is problematic because we have a habit of defining systematic terms and ideas in ways that lead to deductions which work against numerous and explicit statements of Scripture.

The thesis of this essay is that the Bible has some rather shocking things (to Reformed ears anyway) to say about members of the “visible” Church and in particular about those who fall away from the new covenant. I believe the Bible predicates far more of the reprobate in terms of covenant status and gifts than we do.

The Objectivity of the Covenant: A Systematic Summary

The NT forcefully states that all visible Church members, not just those who will persevere to eternal life, are in covenant with God and have been given the status, gifts, and grace that pertain to it. They are all His people and He graciously showers them with many gifts. The following lists help to show this.

Salutations, Names, and Titles Applied to Those in the Visible Covenant (i.e., Who They Are):

Christians: Acts 11:26

Beloved of God: Rom. 1:7

Saints: Rom. 1:7; Eph. 1:1; Phil. 1:1

Saints and faithful brethren: Col. 1:2

Brethren: Rom. 8:12; 12:1; I Cor. 3:1; 10:1; II Cor. 1:8; Phil. 1:12; Gal. 1:11; 3:15; I Thess. 1:4

Holy brethren: Heb. 3:1

Those sanctified in Jesus and called saints: I Cor. 1:2

The body of Christ: Rom. 12:4, 5; I Cor. 12:27

The Church of God: I Cor. 1:2; II Cor. 1:1; I Thess. 2:14

Church in God and Jesus: I Thess. 1:1

The holy, Spirit-indwelt temple of God: I Cor. 3:16, 17; II Cor. 6:16

Sons of God: Gal. 3:26; 4:6; Heb. 12:5-7

Abraham’s seed: Rom. 4:1; Gal. 3:29 w/ v. 27

Children of the (Abrahamic) promise: Gal. 4:28

Members of the household of faith: Gal. 6:10
Followers of the apostles and of the Lord: I Thess. 1:6
Spiritual house and holy priesthood: I Pet. 2:5
Chosen generation, holy nation, and special people of God: I Pet. 2:9, 10

How They Received This Status:

Disciples are made by being baptized into (eis) the Triune God and by being taught: Matt. 28:19

They are baptized into Jesus and His death and thereby united to Him: Rom. 6:3-5

They are baptized by the Spirit into the body (of Christ, cf. 1 Cor. 12:27) and thus drink of the Spirit: I Cor. 12:13

They were circumcised by being buried and raised with Christ in baptism: Col. 2:11, 12

As many as are "baptized into Christ have put on Christ": Gal. 3:27

What They Have Objectively Been Given by Virtue of Their Covenant Membership:

God purchased the specific congregation at Ephesus with His own blood: Acts 20:28

A calling of Jesus Christ: Rom. 1:6

God's love: Rom. 5:8

Christ died for: Rom. 5:8; 8:32; Eph. 5:2

The Spirit's intercession: Rom. 8:26

Christ's intercession: Rom. 8:34

Mercy: Rom. 11:30, 31

Grace: Rom. 12:6; II Cor. 8:1

"[enrichment] in everything by Him... so that you come short in no gift...": I Cor. 1:4-6

The Spirit of God: I Cor. 2:12

All things: I Cor. 3:21, 22

Belong to Christ: I Cor. 3:23

Begotten through the gospel to be "beloved children" of Paul: I Cor. 4:14, 15

Mosaic and Davidic promises to be God's people/children and have Him dwell w/ them: II Cor. 6:16 - 7:1

Jesus gave Himself for their sins: Gal. 1:4

Called by the grace of Christ: Gal. 1:6

A beginning in the Spirit: Gal. 3:3; 5:7

They had been "known by God": Gal. 4:9

Blessed with every spiritual blessing: Eph. 1:3

Predestined to holiness and adoption as sons: Eph. 1:4, 5

Redemption and forgiveness of sins: Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; 3:13

Life from the dead: Eph. 2:5; Col. 2:13

Salvation: Eph. 2:8

Members of the household of God: Eph. 2:19

Members of the holy temple of the Lord: Eph. 2:21, 22

Qualified to partake of the inheritance of the saints: Col. 1:12
Deliverance from the power of darkness into the kingdom: Col. 1:13
Election: Col. 3:12; I Thess. 1:4; I Pet. 1:2
The Holy Spirit: I Thess. 4:8 (keep in mind that Saul received the Spirit but was later abandoned by Him)
Chosen for salvation: II Thess. 2:13
Partakers of a heavenly calling: Heb. 3:1
Membership in the city of God, the New Jerusalem, the Church with Jesus as its mediator: Heb. 12:22-24
Sprinkled by Jesus' blood: Heb. 12:22-24 (cf. Heb. 10:29)
Enlightenment: Heb. 10:32
Sanctification by Jesus' offering of Himself: Heb. 10:10
Rebirth: I Pet. 1:1-3
Redemption by the blood of Christ: I Pet. 1:18, 19
Christ's atonement for sins: I Pet. 2:24
All things pertaining to life and godliness through the knowledge of God: II Pet. 1:3

What They Have That Can Be Lost, Fallen From, or Abandoned:

Hears the "word of the kingdom" and "receives it with joy": Matt. 13:18-21
Kingdom of heaven is like a man whose debt (i.e., sin) was forgiven but he was unforgiving so he was delivered to "the torturers" (i.e., hell) until he paid his whole debt. "So My heavenly Father also will do to you [if you are unforgiving].": Matt. 18:21-35
Life from the word of God: Luke 8:4-7, 11, 13
The kingdom of God: Matt. 21:43
Faith/belief: "Believe for a while" (Luke 8:13); Simon "believed" "the word," "things concerning the kingdom of God," and "the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 8:4, 9-25); it is possible to "believe in vain" and thus not be saved (I Cor. 15:2); some had strayed from a "sincere faith" (I Tim. 1:5-7, "sincere faith", cf. II Tim. 1:5); some thrust away faith and thus made shipwreck of their faith (I Tim. 1:18-20); some had strayed from "the faith" (I Tim. 4:1; 6:10); "overthrow the faith of some" (II Tim. 2:18)
Being in Christ: John 15:1-10
Being graphed into the covenant and being partakers of the root and fatness of it: Rom. 11:16-22
"One for whom Christ died" can be destroyed by causing him to go against conscience: Rom. 15:15
Communion w/ body and blood of Christ: I Cor. 10:1-12, 16, 17 (just as those who died under judgment in the wilderness partook of Christ)
Beginning in the Spirit: Gal. 3:1-5 (cf. Gal. 5:1-4)
"The liberty by which Christ has made us free": Gal. 5:1-4
Grace: Gal. 5:1-4
Reconciliation to God can be lost if one doesn't continue in the faith: Col. 1:21-23

Some had strayed from a pure heart: I Tim. 1:5-7 (“pure heart”, cf. Matt. 5:8; 2 Tim. 2:22; Heb. 10:22)
 Some had strayed from or thrust away a “good conscience”: I Tim. 1:5-7; 1:18-20 (“good conscience”, cf. Acts 23:1; 1 Pet. 3:16, 21)
 “Departing from the living God”: Heb. 3:12
 Enlightenment: Heb. 6:4 (“enlightened,” cf. Heb. 10:32-34; Eph. 1:18)
 “Tasted the heavenly gift”: Heb. 6:4 (“tasted” means to partake of, cf. Heb. 2:9)
 “Partakers of the Holy Spirit”: Heb. 6:4 (“partakers,” cf. Heb. 3:1, 14)
 “Tasted the good word of God and the powers of the world to come”: Heb. 6:5 (“tasted”, cf. Heb. 2:9)
 Repentance: Heb. 6:6
 Having Christ’s crucifixion applied to them: Heb. 6:6
 Receives “blessing from God”: Heb. 6:7
 “The knowledge of the truth”: Heb. 10:26
 “A sacrifice for sins”: Heb. 10:26
 Sanctification by the blood of Christ: Heb. 10:29 (sanctify, cf. Heb. 2:11; 10:10-14; 13:12)
 Cleansing from sin: II Pet. 1:9
 Being bought by the Lord: II Pet. 2:1 (bought, cf. Acts 20:28; I Cor. 6:19, 20; 7:23; Rev. 5:9; 14:3, 4)
 Go astray from “the right way”: II Pet. 2:15
 Entangled again after escaping from pollutions of the world through the knowledge of Christ: II Pet. 2:20
 “Known the way of righteousness”: II Pet. 2:21
 “Beware lest you fall from your own steadfastness”: II Pet. 3:17
 “Your first love”: Rev. 2:4, 5
 One’s name in the Book of Life: Rev. 3:4, 5; 22:19 in the AV (cf. Ps. 69:28)
 Christ’s love: Rev. 3:14-16, 19

These lists are forceful enough for the many themes they contain. The NT predicates many things of Church members in general that I have only ever heard predicated of “true believers,” “the truly regenerate,” or “the elect” in Reformed circles. I’m still enough of a rationalist and a “TR” to be made nervous and uncomfortable by a few of the things that the NT casually predicates of all Church members. It is clear that our system defines terms and gives grace/gifts far more restrictively than does the NT.

But apart from the specific points made by the various items on these lists, a systematic point can also be made. When it comes to the question of how God relates to His covenanted people (and the sub topics of covenantal objectivity and apostasy), there is basic continuity between the old covenants and the new covenant. From these lists, we can point out some of the major themes where there is general continuity between the OT and the NT:

Abraham’s seed

The circumcision (Phil. 3:3)
 Being clean (II Pet 1:9 vs. OT cleanings)
 Quotes from the OT used in the NT (I Pet. 2:9, 10)
 Holy people
 Church of God / Assembly of Yahweh
 Vine/olive tree/garden
 Israel/new Israel
 Adoption into the family (Rom. 9:4)
 Known by God (Amos 3:2; Gal. 4:9)
 God's love
 Election
 Being "sacramentalized" into the covenant head (I Cor. 10)
 Partaking of the covenant meal(s)
 Priestly people
 Having a sacrifice for sin
 Having the same promises in NT as in OT: God dwells w/ them and sons of God (II Cor. 6:16 – 7:1)
 Temple of God
 Restored house of David (Acts 15)
 Membership in the city of God (Heb. 12)

The astute observer will notice that we have just listed, in order, many of the major themes that make up the three major old covenants – the Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Davidic covenants. These themes are developed and fulfilled in the NT and they are applied to the whole new covenant Assembly of God (the "visible" Church) just as they were applied to the whole OT assembly. Their fulfillment is not reserved solely for those who persevere to eternal life but for all of those brought into the covenant community. In this way, the NT applies these themes the same way the OT does – visibly and "objectively."

Thus, the NT casually and consistently assumes a fundamental continuity between the OT and NT when it comes to how God relates to all of His chosen people (including those who are unfaithful). If God had wanted to show a fundamental discontinuity between the two testaments at this point by saying that the OT was "external" and "objective" while the NT is "internal", "subjective," and only for those who are foreordained to persevere to final glory, we would be forced to conclude that He had done an awfully poor job of it. Not only does the NT make all manner of "objective" statements regarding what all NC members are given, it seems to make a repeated point of linking these gifts with the very themes applied to the visible community under the old covenants.

The Objectivity of the Covenant: A Narrative Approach

In this section, I want to present some of the previous material in a different format. What follows are summaries of three NT books with respect to the

subject of this essay. The previous material is presented in a rather general and systematic way. The following should help complement that approach by focusing on specific congregations and by summarizing their situations according to the way they are described by the biblical text.

I Corinthians:

Paul began by calling the Corinthian congregation the “church of God” – those sanctified in Jesus and called saints (1:2). He thanked God for the grace that He had given to them and that because of this grace, they had been “enriched in everything by Him... so that [they came] short in no gift...” (1:4-6). Paul also called them “brethren” numerous times (e.g., 3:1; 10:1). He reminded them that they were the holy, Spirit-indwelt temple of God (I Cor. 3:16, 17). And later in his letter, Paul also reminded them that they were all baptized by the Spirit into the one body and had thus been made to drink the one Spirit (12:13). Therefore they were all members of the body of Christ (12:27) and they all had communion with Christ (10:16, 17). They had received the gospel and they stood in it (15:1).

But these were the same people that Paul had to harshly criticize because of a number of serious problems such as sectarianism, a lack of discipline, and abuse of the Eucharist. These problems called for stern warnings and a comparison between the gentile Corinthians and Israel in the wilderness. The Corinthians’ Jewish fathers (the Corinthians had, after all, really been adopted into the one family) had been baptized into Moses and had partaken of the same spiritual food: Christ. And yet their bodies were scattered in the wilderness because they had been unfaithful. They had been given important and efficacious gifts but had squandered them in unbelief and so were judged. So even with all of the gifts that the Corinthians had been given, their situation was not unique. They were in fact in a situation quite comparable with their Jewish fathers when it came to the topic of the loss of spiritual gifts. And the same condemnation could fall on them if they chose to squander the gracious gifts given to them. They should therefore heed the example Paul cited – an example that was written for their admonition (10:1-11).

Yet even though their behavior was rebellious, Paul was still quite comfortable with strong affirmations of their real, substantial, and full covenant membership and participation in Christ. In fact, it is just because of their full, objective status that Paul could then apply the intimate “family” rebukes and warnings to them. Those who are outside of Christ and “strangers to the covenants of promise” do not provoke the Lord to jealousy (cf. 10:22; II Cor. 11:2). God is not cheated on or betrayed by those not united to Him.

Galatians:

The Galatian Christians had begun well and in the Spirit (3:3; 5:7). They formed real churches (1:2). They had been called by the grace of Christ (1:6) who gave Himself for their sins and to rescue them from an evil age (1:4). Paul thought of them as “brothers” (1:11; 3:15). They were all baptized into Christ (3:27) and were therefore sons of God (3:26; 4:6). They were children of the promise (4:28) and members of the household of faith (6:10). They had been “known by God” (4:9).

And yet Paul had doubts about them (4:20) and called them “foolish” and “bewitched” (3:1) because they had been duped into thinking that they needed to go under the Mosaic covenant in order to be faithful to God. Such a move would have been a grave sin. It would have meant that they were denying that Jesus fulfilled and transformed the old covenants such that there is now neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision. They had already been baptized into Christ and therefore had the fullness of covenantal grace. It is just because they really had what Paul ascribed to them that a denial of Christ’s work by them would have been an estrangement from Christ and a real fall from real grace (5:2-4). One can not fall from a place one was never at.

Hebrews:

The recipients of the epistle to the Hebrews were “holy brethren” who were “partakers of a heavenly calling” (3:1). They were the sons of God and were treated as such (12:5-7). They were members of the city of God, the New Jerusalem. This is to say, they were members of the Church with Jesus as its mediator (12:22-24). They were receiving the unshakable kingdom (12:28).

Their calling gave them access to the promise of the eternal inheritance (9:15), for Jesus appeared before the face of God for them (6:17-20; 9:24). They were the beloved who had shown the fruit of good works (6:9, 10). They had been “enlightened” (10:32) and sanctified by Jesus’ self-offering (10:10). In other words, they had been sprinkled by His blood (12:22-24). Thus, they had boldness to enter into the holy place by that blood (10:19, 20). Because they were part of the house of God with Jesus as its priest, they could draw near to God (10:21, 22).

And even though they had all of this (or rather, because they had all of this), they still needed to persevere. They needed to give heed to what they had heard lest they drift away from all that they had been given (2:1). For if the judgment for OT covenantal apostasy was sure, the judgment for apostasy from the great salvation of the new covenant will surely come (2:2, 3). The recipients were compared to those who fell in the wilderness (3; 4). Unlike those who fell due to unbelief, they had indeed entered God’s rest (4:3). But they still needed to be diligent to enter that rest so that they would not fall

according to the OT example (4:11). Thus, they needed to beware of unbelief – something that can cause one to depart from the living God (3:13).

For it is possible for someone to be enlightened, to have tasted of the heavenly gift, to be partakers of the Holy Spirit, to be repentant, and to have Christ's crucifixion applied to him and yet fall away from all of these blessings (6:4-8). If the Hebrews were to abandon Christ in this way, they would no longer have a sacrifice for sins (10:26). Covenantal adultery under the old covenant brought strong retribution, but apostasy from the new covenant would be a greater betrayal (not a lesser one) and would therefore bring a more severe judgment. To whom much is given, much is required, and the Hebrews had been sanctified by the blood of the new and better covenant. Betrayal of this would come at a very high price (10:26-29).

The Judgment of Charity View

One way that this huge amount of material has been viewed (some would say "brushed aside") in the Reformed world is by way of a "judgment of charity." The thought is that when a writer addresses a group of people in the Church (e.g., a congregation), it makes sense to write to them as if they are who they claim to be – Christians. And surely it was the case in NT times that most of them were. Thus, the biblical writers made a "judgment of charity" with regarding to any specific individual within the group to whom he was writing. This individual claimed to be a Christian and he was part of a group of Christians so he was addressed as such. But if it turned out later that he showed himself to be unfaithful – to be an unbeliever – then we can revise our initial judgment with regard to this person and say based on better evidence that he was not a Christian after all. He was baptized, he was with Christians, and he claimed to be a Christian, but he was an impostor. On this view then, Christian principles led the NT writers to accept someone's credible profession of faith at face value. But if that person later showed himself to be an unbeliever, the writers could revise that judgment and say that he was not really a covenant member after all. He was simply a fraud. And we know this because we know that true faith/salvation/etc. cannot be lost.

So what is wrong with viewing the statements made of new covenant members as "judgments of charity" (JOC)? To begin with, such an explanation is never explicitly taught. The biblical writers never use this concept/language by saying that it is only presumed that covenant members have such and such a status or such and such gifts/graces. Instead, they directly say who these people are (i.e., their "status") and what they have been given. The JOC view is obviously quite important to some versions of Reformed systematics. If it were as important to the overall biblical message and if the biblical writers were really writing all of their letters/comments

based on a tentative and revisable assumption, one would think that they would at least occasionally mention this fact. But they never do.

The writers do not say that they merely assume their audience members are holy, brethren, members of the Church of God, members of the New Jerusalem, etc. They do not tell them that they may have been baptized into Christ (and Jesus did not tell the apostles to baptize people in the hopes that they would be in Him). They do not tell them that they may have various promises and gifts but only if they have been “truly converted.” Over and over again, the writers plainly tell many people who they are and what they have been given. Notice that at this point, I’m not claiming that the JOC could have no biblical justification at all or that it could not even be inferred as a “good and necessary consequence.” But the point here is that this crucially important and far reaching concept is not held because its supporters found four or five clear examples where the principle itself is explicitly mentioned and described. Rather, the concept is generally held because it is thought to be a logically necessary arbiter between two lines of biblical data that seem to run counter to one another (i.e., covenantal objectivity on the one hand and some Reformed systematic doctrines such as the five points on the other hand).

Unfortunately, this arbitration is quite one-sided. To see this, we can think of all of the passages that teach on God’s exhaustive sovereignty and foreordination along with all of the passages that teach on man’s volitional choices and moral responsibility. There appears to be a real tension here, but the typical Reformed answer is that the two sets of passages are in fact compatible. It is the Arminian view that tries to remove the tension by effectively eviscerating God’s sovereignty through various qualifications and explanations. The Reformed community holds both concepts to be equally true and rejects the idea that there is a contradiction between them but it does not try to supply an exhaustive description of the mechanics of how the two concepts relate. The JOC attempts to explain a different tension, but as with the Arminian view just mentioned, it can only do so by cutting the legs out from under one (quite full) line of biblical data. Instead of defending both lines, one is protected by the sacrifice of the other. And yet this rather one-sided solution has not come about because it seems clearly to be taught in Scripture but rather because some think that it is logically necessary and because they do not know of anything else that will accomplish the “tension-removing” task. This is a very slender thread with which to hold and wield a rather tendentious and truncating hermeneutical weapon, especially one with such a wide purview. We should therefore be very slow to adopt and apply such a principle. Its *prima facie* plausibility is low.

But the JOC only loses plausibility when we focus in on the sheer volume of material it would need to address. The JOC would be much more plausible if the Bible usually talked about covenantal status and gifts in third person

language (e.g., the elect are holy, the truly converted have been given this and that) and only rarely talked about these things in the second person (e.g., you are saints, you have been baptized into Christ, you have been given this and that). In that case, the JOC would explain a few apparent exceptions in terms of the language of that which was the norm. But the Bible constantly speaks of these things in the second person and it does so using a variegated raft of terms, phrases, and even arguments. This is hardly an exception; it is the norm. If we find that we must qualify the norm out of existence, our system is in serious need of revision.

Things only get worse for the JOC when we note that the Bible links the status of covenant members with their privileges and responsibilities. Perhaps a JOC can be consistent with simple salutations or names, but when the Bible actually spends several sentences recording that people have been baptized into the body and thus have this or that privilege/responsibility, the JOC loses what little appeal it had left. How can one tell a child that he has the responsibility as a member of the family to take out the trash if his adoption into the family was really a JOC? Was he actually adopted into the family or not? If not, then the rest of the sentence – his privileges, responsibilities, etc. – become non sequiturs. We can't have our cake and eat it too by telling him that he definitely has the responsibility of a family member but that it is only a JOC that he has the *raison d'être* of that responsibility – actual adoption into the family.

Additionally, the JOC is not even applicable to much of the biblical data mentioned above. Once again, if the Bible went no further than salutations or simple, second person statements made to undifferentiated groups, a JOC with respect to any given individual within those groups would have some plausibility. But when the Bible tells us that a specific individual such as Simon Magus had faith, the JOC cannot apply even in theory. We are no longer talking about something said of a group that is true for most of its members but that may not be true for some (and we don't know who those people would be). We are talking about something that is directly predicated of a specific individual. It is either true of him or it is not, and the Bible tells us that it is true. There is no ignorance here for which we must make an assumption.

Moreover, there are straightforward, generalized, didactic statements listed above where the JOC cannot apply. If I say to a group gathered in an auditorium, "I'm glad to see all of you ticket holders here tonight for this wonderful concert," the JOC could have applicability. I am addressing a group in the second person by assuming that everyone in attendance has a ticket for the concert. But it is possible that a few people slipped into the auditorium without paying for tickets. If I found them during the intermission and had them thrown out, I could then revise my JOC with respect to these particular people. I now know that these individuals were in

the group of ticket holders but they themselves did not have tickets. But third person, didactic propositions such as "Ticket holders can show their tickets at the concession stand for a free drink" cannot be candidates for a JOC. Such a statement is not a generalization addressed to a mixed group; it is a direct predication of anyone who is part of the subject. Biblical statements of this type include "Some hear the word of the kingdom, receive it with joy, and believe for a while," "Branches that are in Christ but fail to bear fruit will be cast out," "As many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ," and "Some have tasted the heavenly gift". Statements such as these are not subject to a JOC even in theory because they are statements of fact made about anyone in the subject group.

The Bible also discusses many specific gifts that can be lost. Obviously, the JOC is inapplicable here as well. It would simply make no sense to say that I am making a JOC with regard to the nature of some gift. The JOC is a principle used to address our ignorance regarding some individual within a group. The group in general has quality X but some specific individual may or may not have it. We don't know for sure. But the Bible's statements regarding gifts that can be lost are very different statements. They have nothing to do with our ignorance of an individual within a group. They are straightforward statements of fact about quality X. We do not need to know anything about any specific individual because individuals are not part of the subject of the statement. The quality itself is the subject and there is no ignorance regarding its nature.

Finally, if the JOC were true and ubiquitous throughout the NT, the universal answer to apostasy would be that apostates never had anything significant to begin with. We thought they were "in" but they later showed that they were still pagans. But numerous passages that address apostasy say the very opposite. In fact, the judgments described by them are predicated on the fact that what was said of the apostates was actually true. The basis of the judgment for adultery/treason was just that those judged really were part of God's wife/nation and that they abandoned real gifts/grace. When parallels are drawn or when arguments are made in these passages (e.g., I Cor. 10; Heb. 10), they absolutely require that the apostates actually had what was predicated of them. If there was only a "judgment of charity," the arguments would turn into rather bizarre non sequiturs. But the biblical statements regarding what apostate covenant members lose are not speculative judgments capable of being revised. These states are quite clear: the apostates actually had these gifts and they actually squandered them, and such treason is the very basis for their harsh punishment.

In short, the JOC is a manifestly tendentious and systematically driven hermeneutical weapon, it is not directly taught by the Bible, it can not do justice to the sheer volume of certain ways in which the Bible speaks/teaches, it cannot make sense of familial responsibilities, it is not

even applicable to many biblical statements regarding the objectivity of the covenant, and it is contradicted by the arguments and assumptions related to apostates and their judgment. There is no way to be charitable to the JOC. It simply doesn't work.

The Hypothetical Warnings View

There is another view in Reformed circles that I believe has the effect of downplaying the force of the new covenant "warning passages" (and thus, it downplays the objectivity of the covenant). This view states that the new covenant warnings are "hypothetical." This is to say that the warnings accurately describe what would happen if apostasy were to occur, but in reality, we know that such apostasy does not or can not occur because of doctrines such as the perseverance of the saints. We are therefore told that the point of the warning passages is to be a means by which God keeps His elect from actually doing what the passages describe. So the passages are not irrelevant or useless. While the content of the passages – the apostasy – can not occur, the passages themselves are used by God to sanctify and preserve His elect.

I do not have any problem with the "warnings-as-a-means-of-encouraging-faithfulness" part of this explanation. I have no doubt that God's warnings are in fact one way by which He keeps some people faithful to Him. But the "hypothetical" part of this explanation cannot be true because a number of the major NT warnings are not simply warnings. They are warnings that draw direct parallels with situations where people had in fact apostatized. God did not simply say, "This is what would happen if someone were to fall away." He said, "If you fall away, I will judge you like I judged these other apostates on whom I had shown grace and showered with many gifts." There was nothing hypothetical about the apostasy of the Jews in the wilderness and there was nothing hypothetical about the Jews in the 1st Century whom the Roman Christians saw cut out of the covenant. And the warnings given to the Christians drew direct and explicit parallels between the situations of those Jews and the situation of the Christians. Thus, there was nothing hypothetical about their situation. The warnings given to the Christians were just as real as those given to the Jews. Faith believes the warnings and trembles. It is covenantal presumption (e.g., "Abraham is our father," Luke 3:8; John 8:39) that tries to brush them off as hypothetical but impossible.

We can also note an interesting contrast. Some who hold to the hypothetical warnings view try to draw a major contrast between the old covenant and the new covenant at this point. They admit that real apostasy from the old covenant was possible and did occur but they claim that things are different under the new covenant. Such apostasy is not possible now because the new covenant is unbreakable; it is only made with the eschatologically elect.

Yet at the very place where this view tries to draw a stark contrast, the NT warnings draw a direct parallel. Far from being unlike the old covenant when it comes to the subject of apostasy, the new covenant is very much like it. To the Corinthian Christians for example, Paul wrote that the Jews in the wilderness had the same spiritual gifts and yet they fell away. Thus, the punch line was that the Corinthians should take heed and learn from this example which was written in Scripture for them. Their situation was directly analogous to and comparable with the Jews in the wilderness. They had the covenant gifts but they too could fall. Paul also told the gentile Roman Christians not to be presumptuous or they would be cut out of the covenant tree just like the natural Jewish branches that had been cut out. In the letter to the Hebrews, we are even given something more. It is not just that there is a parallel drawn with those under the old covenant. Several times, an a fortiori argument is constructed. Thus, we are told that the judgment for apostasy from the new covenant would be much more severe than was the judgment for apostasy from the old covenant. Not only is NT apostasy possible and not only is it like OT apostasy, it is actually OT apostasy on steroids.

Thus, at the very place where some try to draw a strong contrast, the NT draws a strong parallel and even goes beyond that parallel. Under the old covenant, apostasy was adultery. Some would have us believe that such adultery cannot really occur under the new covenant because those united to Christ cannot betray Him. Those who do abandon Christianity, it is therefore claimed, were never really Christians at all. So instead of adultery, their crime has been lowered to spiritual fornication coupled with misrepresentation (identity theft, perhaps?). Yet the NT says the very opposite. Not only is betrayal of the new covenant like that of the old covenants, it is actually worse: adultery on steroids as it were. To whom much is given, much is required. Non-elect (in the Westminster Confession sense of 'elect') members of the new covenant have not been given less than non-elect members of the old covenant, they have been given more. This is precisely why the warning language in the NT is so strong.

This stark difference can be summarized from another angle: the way in which conclusions are drawn. Some rightly note that the gifts given under the new covenant are "greater" than those given under the old covenant. This supposedly leads to the fact that the new covenant is unbreakable. Therefore, "true" believers cannot fall away, and those who do fall away never had any real or significant covenant status/gifts to begin with. So they need to repent and believe for the first time so that they may become Christians for the first time. But the Book of Hebrews draws the opposite conclusion. All of its early chapters are given over to arguing that the new covenant in Jesus is superior to and a fulfillment of the old covenants. But far from drawing conclusions regarding the impossibility of apostasy from such a superior covenant, the book concludes that such apostasy is not only possible but is actually worse

than apostasy from the old covenants. Some hypothetical warnings supporters look at the newness and greatness/superiority of the new covenant and conclude that it is so great that one cannot fall from it. But the book of Hebrews tell us that because of the newness and greatness of the new covenant, there can be such a fall and that it would be much worse than apostasy in the old age. The difference is striking.

Conclusion

So where does all of this leave us? Has this essay denied any meaningful notion of Reformed doctrines such as limited atonement and perseverance of the saints? No, but it does argue against simplistic, reductionistic versions of such doctrines. I have often seen (and been one of) those in Reformed circles who read the NT as if it were written like a philosophy textbook – dealing with generalized doctrines in an atemporal, systematic, and comprehensive manner. From this reading, they form a set of universal, unqualified propositions. These propositions (which are pretty much all from decretal theology) address topics such as election, regeneration, perseverance, etc. The relevant terms are defined in technical and restrictive ways. The propositions are then arranged in logical/temporal order. This “ordo salutis,” Tulip, or similar systematic construction is then used to draw all kinds of unwarranted conclusions – conclusions that bump pretty hard up against many “plain” NT passages. If someone does not persevere, it proves that he had nothing real to begin with. Otherwise, if we admit that he had been shown real covenantal grace and been given many gifts, we will have contradicted one or more of our decretal propositions.

But none of this follows. Perseverance, for example, does not require us to say that non-persevering people never received anything significant in terms of covenantal grace. And the idea of a limited, efficacious atonement does not logically require an all or nothing approach whereby someone either perseveres to eternal life because Jesus died for him or he gets nothing because Jesus’ death was not meant to secure anything at all for him. If Jesus died to secure the temporary faith of Simon Magus (and only that much for him), this still means that the atonement was limited in scope and fully efficacious regarding that which it was meant to secure. But we define “regeneration” differently from the biblical usage (usually as if it was some kind of permanent metaphysical transformation or infusion of a substance called “grace”), link it absolutely and completely to election (which is also defined in a very narrow and technical way), and conclude that only the “elect” can be “regenerate.” This by itself would not be “fatal” but we then combine it with a strong tendency to put the protective fence up three miles away from the actual systematic doctrines it is meant to protect. And so the “reprobate” (even those in the Church) can not have anything that even remotely smells of this internal metaphysical change which means, in the end, that they can not have (or lose) anything that the Bible clearly and

repeatedly says that they have and/or lose. And so we must engage in sometimes embarrassing hermeneutical gymnastics in order to “explain” (or is it explain away?) passages like the ones catalogued above. For a community that prides itself on its intellectually sophisticated and mature theology, this does not make us look scholarly.

We rightly object to this kind of thing when performed by Arminians (e.g., rationalistic deductions from statements about human responsibility and choice that contradict numerous passages that describe God’s sovereignty) for example. But we often do the very same thing and we do it in order to guard against contradictions which do not exist (e.g., the belief that someone can have “true” faith for a time and lose it does nothing to endanger good, hearty doctrines of sovereignty, election, and perseverance). Before the foundation of the world, God foreordained that John Doe would accept Christ as Lord and Savior and would have true faith. Christ died to secure this gift for Doe. But God also decreed that Doe would later abandon his faith and leave the body of Christ, and sometime after coming to the faith, Doe did in fact choose of his own volitional will to abandon Christ. And so Doe’s final state was worse than his former unbelief – worse than the unbelief of someone who had never accepted Christ. God is sovereign, man makes meaningful and volitional choices, Christ’s atonement secures all that it was meant to secure, those who have been so ordained do persevere to eternal life, real apostasy from God does occur, and such apostasy is far worse than the unbelief of those who have never been the recipients of covenantal grace.

There is a final misunderstanding that I want to address here. When a Federal Vision advocate describes the objectivity of the new covenant, it is common for his critics to see the spectre of nominalism raising its ugly head. If people really do get all of these gifts by virtue of their covenant membership, if they really are in Christ by virtue of their baptism, and if they really are “Christians” and “holy” without regard to how trusting or faithful they are, then surely we have here the recipe for presumption. People will be inoculated against a true “inner” trust in God by being told that they are already Christians simply because they were baptized. They will be led to trust in outward rituals and in their objective status even though they have not really been converted and do not really have faith in God. The Federal Vision therefore eliminates the need for an explicit conversion and/or “closure with God” and it encourages nominalism.

The existence of this objection is understandable. After all, we have plenty of examples throughout the history of Christendom where a theological paradigm that contained a robust view of objectivity helped foster and exacerbate formalism and unfaithfulness. American Protestants are probably most familiar with how this works in some parts of Roman Catholicism or Anglicanism for example. Theologically liberal groups usually have at least some view of the objectivity of Christianity and this only feeds the rampant

nominalism therein. One of the main tools used by “conservative, Bible-believing” Christians to combat this enemy is the punctiliar, one-time conversion/confession. This conversionistic paradigm insists on a specific point at which the individual has become mature enough to convert/confess/make the faith his own. Without this explicit transition point, the great fear is that there will be no real defense against formalism. And the Federal Vision, with all of its talk of covenantal objectivity, doesn’t really seem to provide this kind of subjective, punctiliar conversion point.

But the critics of covenantal objectivity should realize that not all views of objectivity originate from the same theological paradigm, and it is quite possible for two groups to hold similar views of some concepts for very different reasons. And this can lead these groups to implement these concepts in very different ways and to draw very different implications from them. As it turns out, the Federal Vision advocates’ view of covenantal objectivity operates very differently from the aforementioned formalistic groups, and it actually has stronger tools to fight formalism than does the conversionistic paradigm. For instead of a single conversion, those who see the objective aspects of the covenant are also comfortable viewing “regeneration” as a lifelong process. A two year old should have behavior and a personal confession that are age-appropriate. The same goes for a 10 year old, a 20 year old, and so forth. Every day and at every age, it is central to covenantal identity that we make age-appropriate prayers of repentance, confessions of our faith, and the like, and the maturity level of these things should grow as we get older. Moreover, it is not in spite of the objectivity of the covenant that these things should occur but because of it. It is just because we actually have the status and gifts mentioned above that we have the responsibility to constantly confess this faith while fully trusting the Lord for all things and to appropriate and grow in all the gifts we have been given.

Thus, the fear of formalism can be countered by pointing out that the Federal Vision does not just look for or focus on a one-time transition. It focuses on an entire life of transitioning from the old man to the new man – working out salvation with fear and trembling. During every day and at every age, Christians should be exhibiting age-appropriate faith, confession, and behavior (and this applies in private prayer, in family life, in public worship, on the street – everywhere).

Finally, the charge of formalism can be finished off by pointing out what should be obvious: the Federal Vision has a strong and developed view of apostasy (and therefore of Church discipline). It often seems that when critics charge FV advocates with the promotion of formalism, they are not paying attention to the whole story. But the concepts of covenantal objectivity and apostasy can not be separated and dealt with in isolation. They are, in fact, intimately related. It is just because the status and gifts of the covenant are real that apostasy really exists. The adultery is real

precisely because the marriage really exists. Thus, while some liberal groups may have a concept of objective Christendom that lacks discipline, such a view has no connection with the FV. After all, FV advocates are strong supporters of doctrines such as sola Scriptura and tota Scriptura. Thus, they take the NT warning passages seriously and they teach and discipline accordingly.

For an interesting discussion of what it means for Gods to provide a way out of temptation, see William Edgar, *The Face of Truth*, 122ff.